

Applic. No.: 10/079,114

Amdt. Dated September 15, 2004

Reply to Office action of June 15, 2004

Amendment to the drawings:

Please cancel new Figs. 2B, 2C, and 2D and restore Fig. 2A to
Fig. 2.

Applic. No.: 10/079,114
Amdt. Dated September 15, 2004
Reply to Office action of June 15, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 14-17, and 26 remain in the application.

Claims 1, 3, and 26 have been amended. Claims 8, 11-13, and 18-25 have been cancelled. Claims 2-3, 5, 14-15, and 17 have been allowed.

In the first paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, the Examiner has stated that the proposed new Figures 2B, 2C, and 2D are not approved as being new matter. These new figures have been cancelled.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, the specification has been objected to under 35 USC 132. The amendment to the specification has been reversed to the original text.

In the third paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 8 and 11-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that the structure of the "dendritic structure" (claim 8), "bonding channel"

Applic. No.: 10/079,114
Amdt. Dated September 15, 2004
Reply to Office action of June 15, 2004 .

(claims 11, 12) and "conductor tracks" (claim 13) are unclear from the specification as originally filed.

Claims 8 and 11-13 have been cancelled.

In the fourth paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1, 4, 6-13, 16, and 26 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that "said edge portion" in claim 1 does not have a clear antecedent.

Appropriate correction has been made.

The Examiner has also stated that it is unclear how claim 26 further limits claim 1 because the limitations of claim 1 appear repeated. Claim 26 has been written into independent form. The difference between claims 1 and 26 is that the electronic component as recited in claim 26 does not include the plastic composition covering the profile-sawn contours.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the

Applic. No.: 10/079,114

Amdt. Dated September 15, 2004

Reply to Office action of June 15, 2004

matter may be resolved. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for cosmetic and/or clarificatory reasons. The changes are neither provided for overcoming the prior art nor do they narrow the scope of the claims for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

In the penultimate paragraph on page 3 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1, 9, and 26 have been rejected as being anticipated by Dando (US Pat. No. 6,051,875) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

In the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1, 9-10, and 26 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Dando under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In the second paragraph on page 4 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 6-7 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Dando in view of Saitoh et al. (US Pat. No. 5,883,439) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The rejection has been noted and claims 1 and 26 have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. Support for the changes is found in Figs. 1-3 and the corresponding description in of the specification.

Applic. No.: 10/079,114

Amdt. Dated September 15, 2004

Reply to Office action of June 15, 2004

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claims 1 and 26 call for, inter alia:

the sawn edge having non-straight profile-sawn contours extending into the edge portion(s) of the active upper side.

As already discussed in the previous response, Dando teaches only straight edges.

Dando also does not contain any hint, motivation, or incentive for a person skilled in the art to use a sawn edge having non-straight profile-sawn contours.

The invention of the instant application has the object of providing an electronic component in which a protective plastic composition coating can be more reliably applied on the side edges of a semiconductor chip. According to the invention of the instant application, the side edges of the chip have a non-straight profile-sawn contour so that the plastic composition is in a positive or form-locking engagement with the side edges of the semiconductor chip. This arrangement ensures a more reliable protection of the

Applic. No.: 10/079,114

Amdt. Dated September 15, 2004

Reply to Office action of June 15, 2004

edges of the semiconductor chip since the partial detachment of the plastic composition from the chip is prevented.

Dando teaches the use of a conventional singulation technique which results in the side edges of the semiconductor chip having a straight edge. Dando does not address the problem of the delamination of the plastic coating from the semiconductor chip. Dando provides a person skilled in the art no indication that it is desirable to improve the adhesion of the plastic coating to the semiconductor chip, or that this can be achieved by the provision of non-straight profile-sawn edges to the semiconductor chip.

Clearly, Dando does not show a sawn edge having non-straight profile-sawn contours extending into the edge portion(s) of the active upper side, as recited in claims 1 and 26 of the instant application.

Claims 1 and 26 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over Dando and since claims 6-7 and 9-10 are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's statement in the fifth paragraph on page 4 of the above-mentioned Office action that claims 2-3, 5, 14-15, and 17 have been allowed.

Applic. No.: 10/079,114
Amdt. Dated September 15, 2004
Reply to Office action of June 15, 2004

Applicants also acknowledge the Examiner's statement in the fifth paragraph on page 4 of the above-mentioned Office action that claims 4 and 16 would be allowable if the indefiniteness of claim 1 could be clarified and each were put in completed form as independent claims including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Since claim 1 is believed to be patentable as discussed above and claims 4 and 16 are dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable in dependent form. A rewrite is therefore believed to be unnecessary at this time.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 4, 6-7, 9-10, 16, and 26 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

The fee in the amount of \$86.00 for one additional independent claim in excess of three is enclosed herewith. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to

Applic. No.: 10/079,114
Amdt. Dated September 15, 2004
Reply to Office action of June 15, 2004

the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-
1099.

Respectfully submitted,

LAURENCE A. GREENBERG
REG. NO. 28,308


For Applicants

YC

September 15, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101